

MOM
9 R 27
0

14859
27

THE SOURCES FOR THE DEBATES IN THE HOUSE OF
COMMONS DURING THE SESSION OF 1629:

Being Part of the Introduction to a
Critical Edition of the Nicholas Notes.

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of the University of Minnesota by
Frances Helen Relf in Partial Fulfillment of the Require-
ments for the Degree of Master of Arts, June 1, 1912.

116105

INTRODUCTION.

I. Sources.

To all students of both English History and American History the Session of Parliament for 1629 is important. For the former it marks the beginning of the struggle between King and Parliament which culminated in the Civil War. Rushworth who wrote a history of that period said in his preface, "If you demand why my Collections commence so early, and start at such a distance of time so remote, I must answer, That it was first in my purpose to begin with the Parliament which met Nov. 3, 1640. But after I had perused, ordered, and compared my Printed and Manuscript Relations of the First year of that Parliament, I found they pointed at, and were bottom'd upon some Actions of the late King, in dissolving four preceding Parliaments." But it is only when we come to this last session which met after the death of the Duke of Buckingham that the issue between King and Parliament is clearly stated and recognised by both sides. Elliott's assertions, that the king was still

AUG 6 1912 P. 70

friendly to them, that he was ^{falsely} represented by his ministers, fell upon deaf ears. The complaint was that such ministers had been chosen by the king. Lord Dorchester said only what was clear to all when he wrote of the king's ministers on December 19th, 1628, "Every one walks within the circle of his charge, and his majesty's hand is the chief, and in effect the sold directory"¹. The debates in the session of 1629 show clearly the stand taken which made the war inevitable. There is seen the complete lack of any desire to compromise; the stubbornness on the part of parliament which was met by a seeming compliance, a double-dealing on the part of the king which failed to conceal an even greater obstinancy.

To the student of American History, the importance of this session lies in the fact that it was a direct cause of the great emigration in the following year. Its influence is plainly seen in the Cambridge agreement of August, 1629. That agreement, in turn, changed the whole character of the Massachusetts Bay Company, a change which led to the upbuilding of that colony which was to dominate New England history. It is easy for one who is familiar

1. The Court and Times of Charles First. 2 Vols. London 1848, v. II. p. 2.

with the religious debates in the session of 1629, to understand the attitude of mind, the point of view, of the Puritan Fathers. In those debates is brought out clearly their belief that only the doctrine as they hold it is God's religion, that all else is false. "I find dissolution of Religion in this land, if God himself take not his own cause in hand",¹ stated one of the members. And their whole position on the subject was summed up in "what we conceive may conduce to the Preservation of God's Religion, in great peril now to be lost."² From those debates it is easy to see how far the Puritans had already drifted from the doctrine, and even more from the attitude of mind, of the Church of England; how close they were to that separation any thought of which they denied at the time they came to America. In those debates are to be seen also the democratic tendencies which were to develop so rapidly in the new country.

The title "Session of 1629"³ is misleading, for the whole interest centers in the House of Commons. There was little intercourse between the two Houses; only in the petition for a general fast did they unite. While the

1. Crew, p. 87.

2. Ib. 133-4.

3. Gardiner - History of England. 10 Vol. New Edition, Vol. VII, p 29. Chapter title.

lower house was so hotly discussing the questions of religion and customs, the upper house was calmly deliberating as to whether the newly created barons, viscounts, and earls of Scotland and Ireland should have precedence over them. The Lord's Journal can be disregarded in making up a list of the sources for this session. The sources for what happened in the House of Commons are in the order of their importance: the 'Nicholas Notes', the 'True Relation', the 'Commons' Journal', a narrative of March second, the letters of Nethersole, and the letters of Barrington.

The original manuscript of the Nicholas Notes is to be found in the State Paper Office.¹ The author, Edward Nicholas, afterwards secretary to Charles I, was at this time one of the burgesses to parliament from Dover,² and also secretary to the Commission of Admiralty. The latter explains his special interest in the debates on ~~the~~ tunnage and poundage. The many letters written by Nicholas in his capacity of secretary which are to be found in the State Paper Office and which were handled, in the original by the editor who compiled the Calendar, make it safe to accept the editor's conclusion as to

1.S. P. Dom. 1628-9, Vol. C XXXIV.

2.Cal. S. P. Dom. 1628-9, p 483, no. 73.

the authorship of the Notes. The author's name does not appear on the notes, but the editor could hardly have been mistaken in the hand-writing. The notes themselves show every evidence of having been taken in the House while the different members were speaking. The hand-writing shows it. After comparing it with ~~the~~ Nicholas' hand-writing in the king's speech on the tenth of March, which from the text we know he must have copied, it is easy to conclude that the difference was due to ^{the} greater rapidity with which the notes were written. The formation of the sentences shows it. This we have tried to preserve in the text by keeping as closely as possible to the original capitalization and punctuation. The clearest evidence, however, is to be found in those parts ^{which} ~~the~~ author has scratched out by drawing a line through them. It has not always been possible to make out these parts. Again, in certain places it is clearly evident that the correction was made because the first word or phrase did not express the ~~x~~correct thought. But in other places there can be no doubt that the change was due to a change in the form of a motion or resolution, the result of further debate on the floor. These changes have all been indicated in the notes. For example, on the

6th of February a preemptory order to the Attorney to appear in the House was changed to a polite intimation that "Monday is appointed for him to answer for the houses satisfacon if it please him then to answer it."

Because the notes were written while the debates were going on, it follows that they can be taken as authoritative not only as to the days on which the speeches were delivered but also as to the order of the speeches on each day. But aside from this the Nicholas Notes contain much material not to be found elsewhere. There is hardly a day that Nicholas does not record some speech that would otherwise have been lost. The very important debates on religion that took place January 29th and 31st are found only in Nicholas. His account of all the debates connected with customs is much fuller than any other account. The chief defect in Nicholas is the brevity of the speeches. One feels there was a good deal of selection in what was recorded. We get only that part of the speech which appealed to Nicholas.

Gardiner is the only historian who has made use of the Nicholas Notes. It was his purpose to edit them,

in order to make them accesable to other scholars, but it was one of the tasks for which he never found time. It is at the suggestion of Professor/^{Firth} that the present edition has been undertaken.

The 'True Relation' is the account of the debates which, from the time of Rushworth to our own day, has been the source to which all writers on this period have gone for their information. No one has ever brought to light what he claims to be the original 'True Relation'; but on the other hand there are many copies in existence. There are nine copies in the British Museum¹, and two in the State Paper Office², some have been found in private collections³, and there are undoubtedly many in such collections of which no record has been made. Bruce, in his article in the Archaeologia has grouped the different manuscripts according to their "three degrees of completeness". In the first group he puts those that are "a plain narrative of a somewhat formal character, and occasionally disjointed and fragmentary."

1. Archaeologia, Vol. 38, pp. 237 et seq.

2. Cal. S. P. Dom. 1628-9, p. 453.

3. It was a manuscript from the private collection of Lord Verulam that Gardiner made use of in writing his account of this session. The same manuscript is fully described by Bruce in the Archaeologia. Later a list of Lord Verulam's manuscripts was made for the State Paper Office, but it does not contain any mention of this particular paper. Nor can the present Lord Verulam enlighten us on the subject. Even if, as contended by Bruce and Gardiner, this manuscript is not the "most important of them all," still the fact that Gardiner has depended so upon it makes it unfortunate that we are unable to compare it with the other manuscripts and printed copies.

The title to these he states does not contain the date of the dissolution. The second group he distinguishes by the fuller title, the addition of a paper designated "Heads of Articles...Sub-Committee for Religion", and by a narrative of what occurred upon March 2nd. The third group contains those manuscripts which were compiled with greater care than the preceding and have even a fuller narrative of March 2nd.

There are five printed copies of the 'True Relation', to all of which we had had access. This makes it possible to check up Bruce's classification even without the manuscripts. The first of these to be printed was the 'Diurnall Occurrences of every dayes proceedings in Parliament since the beginning thereof, being Tuesday the twentieth of January, which ended the tenth of March, Anno Dom. 1628." London, 1641. This Bruce has placed in the first group without any explanation of the fact that its title would exclude it. The next printed copy is "A True Relation of every days proceedings since the beginning of this Session, and what was spoken by every man." It forms the second part of Fuller's 'Ephemeris Parliamentaria.'¹ This, too,

1. London 1654.

Bruce places in the first group. In doing so he makes no comment on the fact that through these copies agree word for word in some parts, in other parts they are radically different. Bruce claims that Rushworth's account is printed from the 'Duirnall Occurences'. A close reading of it, however, gives evidence of some material not in that book. In 1707, was printed "Sir Tho. Crew's Collection of the Proceedings of the Parliament in 1628." Neither Bruce nor Gardiner have made any mention of this book. This is the more suprising because Gardiner made frequent use of Forster's "Life of Sir John Eliot" and Forster quotes frequently from Crew. The book was published by a grandson of Crew, John Parkhurst, Esq. who by way of preface says: "You have here published the Proceedings in Parliament, and debates of the House of Commons in the Sessions begun the 20th of January, 1628, and ended by Dissolution the 10th day of March the next following.... These were taken and collected by Sir Thomas Crew, an Honourable and Learned Member of the House of Commons in that Parliament... by whom an Abstract was prefixed to the Sheets in Manuscript of his own proper Character and Hand-writing." This

1. Rushworth - 'Historical Collections' 8 Vol, 2nd Ed. London 1721.
Vol. I, pp. 643-60.

account is much longer than any of the precedings; but the difference in length is not due to its containing many speeches not in the others but to the greater length of the speeches. Aside from the length of the speeches it closely resembles the 'Duirnall' and Rushworth. It contains all the characteristics which Bruce gives as distinguishing the third group. It was probably because of their want of familiarity with Crew that both Bruce and Gardiner blundered so in their estimate of the account of this session given in the 'Old Parliamentary History'¹. The editor of that account states very clearly that his main source was Crew. He had also two manuscripts evidently identical and he makes use of material ^{in them not} found in Crew. In each case either by footnote or brackets he makes clear that he is using the manuscript source. The material taken from the manuscripts is identical with the 'Duirnall'. Yet Bruce says of the 'Old Parliamentary History' that it is a "compilation from previously printed books, and from various manuscripts, which are all intermingled first a passage from one and then from another, in a way which is destructive of both accuracy and authority." And Gardiner after speaking

1. 'Parliamentary History of England! 24 Vol. London 1751. Vol. VII, pp 245-47, 254-333.

of the Verulam manuscript as the best form of the 'True Relation' dismisses the Parliamentary history with the remark that it "has additional matter from other sources."

Mr. Bruce's object in classifying the manuscripts was in order that he might formulate some theory as to the original 'True Relation'. He believed that all the copies were originally derived from the same source; that the manuscripts of the first group showed the account in its first form; that the omission of the date of dissolution showed that it was written while the parliament was still sitting; And so he came to the conclusion that the original "was probably compiled from time to time, perhaps even, as the title may indicate, for day to day, during the sitting of the Parliament, by some person who had access to peculiar sources of information, although without being directly authorised as a reporter." Bruce does not distinguish between the second and third groups as to the time they were written. He does state, however, in another connection, that the Verulam manuscript is nearly contemporary.

The chief fault to be found with Mr. Bruce's theory is that it leaves so many things unexplained. Why is the first account more formal than the later? How can two copies of the first form differ as materially as do the 'Duirnall' and Fuller's? ~~From~~ what sources did the second and third groups obtain their additions? Without answering that question, how can Bruce justify his assertion that the Verulam, for example, is "more important" than Fuller's? We should naturally expect that any document that grew in bulk as it receded from the time of the occurrence would thereby become less reliable, less important. The fact remains, however, that the longer accounts are more reliable. They contain fewer of the kind of errors which arise from frequent copying, as, for example the change from "wound" to "word"¹ the omission of "not" thus changing the whole sense.² Moreover the additions found in groups two and three can most of them be checked by one or more of the other independent accounts. The fact, it seems to me, are all against Mr. Bruce's theory. It is necessary then, taking the facts as they are, to build up a new theory as to the date and character of the origin of the 'True

1. The use of "wound" in Sir Humphrey May's speech on Feb. 23rd is according to Bruce sufficient to identify any Ms. with the third group. Crew gives 'wound'.

2. In Elliot's Speech on the 29th. Found in Crew but omitted in Duirnall.

Relation'.

The first suggestion as to the character of the account comes from Crew. In the title it is called a 'Collection'. Only an abstract attached to the sheets was in Crew's own hand-writing. The longest speeches are given with headings as, "Mr. Rouse, his Speech on Monday, the 26th of January, 1628," "Mr. Pym's Speech 27, January, 1628", "His Majesty's Answer thereunto", "Heads or Articles to be insisted upon....." In the order of the above speeches Crew does not agree either with the other copies of the 'True Relation' or with Nicholas. Not only is the order for the day wrong but the days themselves are hopelessly confused. There could have been little in the manuscript to determine the order, and the grandson who, after nearly one hundred years, tried to straighten out the separate speeches floundered around hopelessly. Both the formal headings and the inaccuracies in the order suggest the origin of the 'True Relation'. It probably began as a collection of speeches, resolutions, reports, and messages. These were not only prefaced by a title, as I have indicated some were in Crew, but some were in the nature of an explanation as:

"Sir Richard Gravenor reports the Proceedings of this House against Popery the last Sessions, and what Fruits have followed thereof since."¹ Or the illuminating note might come at the end of the speech as: "This Speech was occasion'd by Secretary Cooke, who had desir'd moderation might be used."² I do not wish to intimate that Crew is entirely a collection, but only that there are enough speeches in it which from their position in the books, from their length, and from their formal titles prove they were collected, to suggest that this was the origin of all of the True Relation.

This was Fuller's idea of the origin of the accounts of this and the previous session which he published in "Ephemeris Parliamentaria", in the preface to which he says: "Let not any think that all the Gentlemen of able parts assembled in the Parliament are registred in this book by their particular service to their country, seeing only such are entred herein who made set, studied and premeditated Orations." In comparing the speeches of the first session with those of the second he speaks of the latter as being only abstracts whereas the former are

1.Crew 81.

2.Xb. 7.

given in full. It was customary at that time, Fuller also states, for members of parliament to give copies of their speeches to their intimate friends, "the transcripts whereof were multiplied amongst others (the penne being very procreative of issue in this nature)"

Some of these speeches which Fuller says were "so multiplied" are still in existence. In the State Paper Office there are three copies of the speech delivered by Mr. Rous on Jan 26th.¹ There are also single copies of nine other documents which may find a place in the True Relation.² A copy of Elliot's speech of the 29th has been found among the manuscripts of the Duke of Portland.³ A bundle of papers in the Hatton Collection marked "Speeches made in Parliament by members"⁴ suggests that perhaps there, and in other private collections as well, still more copies may be found.⁵

The character of the speeches in the True Relation confirms the collection theory of their origin. They might

1. Cal. S.B. Dpm. 1628-9 p 458. Numbers 13, 14, 15.

2. Jan 27th, Draft in handwriting of Sec. Coke of Message from the King delivered to the House by the Secretary.

Jan. 28th. The King to the House of Commons.

Jan 29th. Copy of the Declaration of the House of Commons,

Jan. 31st. Answer of the House of Commons to messages received from the King.

p. 466.

89. Speech in the House of Commons in which the speaker argues for burning the memory of former unkind passages, and making it their work to restore the peace of the Church and Commonwealth.

90. Speech on the subject of Tonnage and poundage.

91. Another similar speech.

Feb. 23. A message from the King to the House of Commons.

p. 484. no. 80. Speech addressed to the House of Commons, by a Privy Councillor /probably Edmunds on Jan. 28/

easily be confined to the category of set speeches, reports, messages, and resolutions. This is especially conspicuous in the debates on religion. The matters to be discussed were clearly understood before the session under that head^A began. On the first day that any new phase of the subject was introduced, we find many speeches recorded in the True Relation. But when the subject was debated back and forth as on the 29th and 31st of January, when, as we know from Nicholas, each ~~special~~ speech was a quick retort to what immediately preceded it, then we find the account in the True Relation ~~very~~ barren.

But if the True Relation began as a collection by what process did it reach the varying forms in which we find it? There must have been two kinds of change: one an expansion, the other a contraction. Both probably went on at the same time. The expansion was due to the addition of documents, the contraction to the shortening of speeches. The process of expansion separates the manuscript into two general groups according to their subject matter. In one of these can be grouped all the printed copies except Fuller. From what Bruce says in his article, I should infer that Harlean 6800 also belongs to this group.

/Footnotes page 15/

2. p. 485. Mar. 2. Proclamation of King.
3. Hist. MSS. Com. 13th Rept. App. 1, p. 2.
4. Ib. 1st Rept. p. 30.
5. Among the Port Eliot MSS. are to be found:
 1. Elliot's Speech of Jan 29th. (Forster II 214 note)
 2. " " " Mar. 2nd. (" " 242 ")
 3. The resolutions given from memory by Hollis on March 2nd. (Forster II, p245 note)

From what Bruce and Gardiner say of the Verulam manuscript, it bears a marked resemblance to Fuller in title and subject matter, though it is of course much more complete. Only by a careful comparisons of all the manuscripts can the grouping be done or the time of the separation be determined. The process by which the separate documents became a consecutive narrative must have been first an expansion. The first step has been shown in the explanatory sentence at the beginning of close of a speech or report. The second step might well have been a sentence uniting two documents. An example of this is to be found in Crew between a report by Secretary Cooke and the King's answer to the Commons Declaration - "After he had made his own Apology, he read his Majesty's Answer to the Commons Declaration in these Words following. " The process of contraction took place in two ways; either by making an abstract of the speech, or by leaving out the speech entirely and giving only the explanatory sentence. With only the printed copies before one, however, it is impossible to come to any conclusion as to just how all the changes from speeches

to abstracts took place. That can only be determined by a comparison of all the manuscripts. It is especially necessary to compare ^{Crew} with the more complete manuscripts of the same group as Fuller.

There is enough evidence, however, to convince one that the origin of the 'True Relation' was very different from the origin of the Nicholas Notes. It is not likely that it was put together until after the close of the session. It has no value then for matters of date or order of speeches. For the speeches, messages, and reports, themselves, when given at any length, it is of greater value than Nicholas. Another personality has not come between the original writer and the present student. Because of the character of its origin no one copy of the True Relation can be said to be of the greatest value. In general, those most nearly contemporaneous are of course freest from error. But it is not the copy as a whole but the individual speeches in it which must be valued. For this reason we have felt justified in combining all the copies; choosing, in each case, the most complete form of the given speech, using in some cases separate

speeches which have been preserved. Using Nicholas as a guide for the order of proceedings, we have, in this way, been able to build up to some degree a complete 'True Relation'. And it is suprising to find how much more logical it is than any of the more fragmentary/copies. Speeches which before seemed to have no justification are explained when parts from other manuscripts are slipped into their proper places before them. In its complete form the True Relation stands equal in importance with Nicholas. Yet neither one could replace the other. Not only does each contain much material not in the other, but the character of the source gives to each a value that the other does not possess.

The Commons Journal is the official report of the proceedings in that House. It contains some important information not to be found elsewhere, but its chief value is as a check upon the other sources. For order of events during each day, however, the Nicholas Notes must be given precedence. The Journal plainly indicates that its material was organized at the close of each day. Closely related subjects were grouped together

with the result that the true chronological order was destroyed.

In the State Paper Office are to found two manuscripts copies of a narrative account of what occurred in the House of Commons on March second. The authorship is unknown. A study of the manuscripts convinces one that they are both copies, but neither one was copied from the other. From the copies, it is hard to determine the exact nature of the original. It must have been written by an eye-witness, but probably not while the events were occurring as was Nicholas. It was written sometime before May seventh. On that date the Attorney General gave information in the Star Chamber against Elliot, Hollis, Valentine, Long, Coriton, Strode, Selden, Hobart, and Hayman for their part in the proceedings of March 2nd.¹ His attack was based largely upon what we are forced to designate as the 'Narrative of March 2nd'.² All of his direct quotations from speeches made that day are taken verbatim from the 'Narrative'. This is enough to prove that he had that account before him, and it follows that he most likely used it for the narrative as well as for the speeches. Heath's information can then be considered as an independent source ~~for~~ only ^{for} information

1. Rushworth I, 666-70.

2. Gardiner uses Heath as a wholly independent source.

in it which is not to be found in the 'Narrative'. That information was probably obtained from eye-witnesses. It adds a good deal to the 'Narrative.' But Heath's 'Information' serves also to fix an early date for the writing of the 'Narrative'. More than that it gives to the 'Narrative' an official sanction; at that time it was considered a reliable source. In addition to its reliability it is the most detailed account of that important day's proceedings which exists.

The letters of Nethersole¹ and Barrington² were written by members of the lower House while the Parliament was in session. They are a great help in checking, but even more important in giving distinct points of view. They both contain some material not found elsewhere. Because Barrington's letters have never been used by any historian, it seems worth while to call attention to one point which he alone brings out. It is unimportant in itself but still interesting because it illustrates the clever way in which the Arminian bishops were wont to outwit the Puritans. At the beginning of the session the Puritans asked the king for a special fast day.

1. Cal. S. P. Dom. 1628-9. pp. 456, 459, 472.

2. Hist. Mans. Comm. 7th Report pp 544-5. MSS. of G. A. Lowndes.

The king objected; it was a Puritan custom which he did not wish to see established. Because it was poor policy to antagonize the Puritans at the very beginning of the session, he, in the end, gave a reluctant consent but added this restriction, "For the form and time, I will advice with my lords the bishops!"¹ The day decided upon was February 18th. Barrington alone calls our attention to the fact that this was Ash. Wednesday.

When one considers the number, character, and origin of the sources for this session of parliament, the wonder is that there should be such almost perfect agreement among them. Each checks or supplements the others. The result is a record which is suprisingly complete, an indication, surely, that the men of that day realized the importance of the session of 1629.

1. True Relation.

V. Difficulties in editing the Nicholas Notes.

Of all the sources for the session of 1629, the Nicholas Notes have been the most inaccessible. This is due to the fact that the manuscript is so difficult to decipher. It has, of course, the peculiarities in letter formations common to that time. The writing is poor and very fine, so fine that it is almost impossible to read it without the aid of a magnifying-glass. In order to facilitate his note taking Nicholas made use of arbitrary word-signs and abbreviations. There is no key to these. It was only by a comparison of many passages that their meaning could in some cases be ascertained. For these reasons the work of editing has been made very difficult. The purpose is to reproduce as far as possible the capitalization, punctuation, and spelling of the original. But where word-signs have been used there is no way of determining whether the word should be capitalized or not. Consequently we have been obliged to accept modern usage. The question of spelling was much more difficult to decide. Not only were there the abbreviations to expand,

but many words were encountered which were written so poorly that it was impossible to ascertain the exact letters used. In such cases it was thought preferable to adopt the modern spelling unless the word could be found ~~in~~ clearly written in another place. The rules laid down by the American Historical Association for the printing of manuscripts have been followed wherever they apply.

Word-signs used by Nicholas.

v all) we	n now
d be	7 no, not	/ they
< that	4 of	/ God
/ the	7 if	√ unto
to	/ their, there	Y within
- in	0 had	/ period
e and	0 hath	Y/ without
Z for	S our	
/ by	h he	
3 his	Y with	
J this	√ will	

Abbreviations used by Nicholas the expansion of
which is not indicated in the text:

<i>th</i> then, than	<i>wh</i> which
<i>s</i> said	<i>del</i> delivered
<i>ke</i> king's	<i>wh</i> when
<i>mt</i> majesty's	<i>rt</i> right
<i>ag</i> against	<i>yr</i> your
<i>n</i> now	<i>sub</i> subjects

APPENDIX.

The Order of Proceedings
in the
'True Relation'
with Page Reference to
the Printed Copy Con-
taining the Fullest
Account.

Crew 1. The Proceedings.....next following.

" " Upon Tuesday.....settling of the Committees.

" " Wednesday the 21st of January, 1628.

C" 1-2 It was ordered.....Parliament.

" 2 And it was further ordered.....done accordingly.

R" 2 Mr. Selden's Report thereof.

" " Mr. Pym wood.....not then come.

C" 2-3 Sir John Elliot.Since this matter..so ordered.

" 3-4 Mr. Selden. For this Petition..to his Majesty.

" 4 Mr. Norton the King's Printer...by some Warrant.

" " Sir John Elliot desir'd.....was a Warrant.

Crew 5 Thursday the 22d of January, 1628.

" " One Mr. Rolles a Merchant....he would pay them.

" 5-6 Sir Robert Philips said....of these Duties.

" 6-7 Mr. Littleton said, We have....Doom.

" 7 This speech was.....might be us'd.

" 7-8 Sir John Elliot, I see by this....be sent for.

" 8 It was then order'd....be sent for.

" " Mr. Selden reported....Copys be printed.

Crew 9 Friday the 23d of January, 1628.
 " " A Message by Secretary Cooke...Lower House.
 " " Whereas there hath been....take notice.

Saturday the 24th of January.

Crew 9 The King's Speech....the 24th of Jan.
 " 9-12 My Lords and Gentlemen.....Amen.

Monday the 26th of January.

Crew 12-13 Mr. Waller did inform.....Ammunition thither.
 " 12-13 It was thereupon ordered....stay of Ships.
 Rushworth Mr. Secretary Cook delivered....advantage to them.
 Vol. I, 645. But the House being troubled....Sect of Arminians.
 " " "
 Crew 14-18 Mr. Rouse his Speech..... Amen.
 " 23 Sir Francis Seymour.....undone above.
 " 23-24 Sir Robert Philips. I hold my self....our Counsels.
 " 13-4 Mr. Sherland said, We have...Degree and Quality.
 " 18-19 Mr. Kerton's Speech....my best herein.

Tuesday the 27th of January.

Crew 24 A Petition was exhibited against one Lewis..be sent for
 " 25 Sir Nathaniel Rich tendered a Petition...viz.
 " 25-7 Most Gracious Sovereign, It is....Friends and Allies.

- Crew 27-8 His Majesty's Answer....to both Houses.
- " 28 Mr. Pym came from the Committee...no further therein.
- " 28-9 Secretary Cooke delivered a Message...as followeth.
- " 29-32 Sir Walter Earle, Mr. Speaker, I am..Precedency.
- " 32 Mr. Coriton said, Let us...debate thereof.
- " 20-22 Mr. Pym's Speech 27 January...of the Kingdom.

Wednesday the 28th of January.

- Crew 41 Secretary Cooke's second Message...put it off.
- " " Mr. Long. I cannot.. make him diffident of us.

Cal. S.P.Dom.

1628-9, 484, Sir Thomas Edmunds (compare with Crew p.42).
No. 80.

- Crew 42-3 Mr. Coriton, When Men Speak..to his Majesty.
- " 43 Sir John Elliot spoke to the same effect.
- " " Whereupon it was ordered...not to them.

Thursday the 29th of January, 1628.

- Crew 43-4 The former part of the day...a stay of them.
His Majesty answered...in due time.
- Crew 32-40 Sir John Elliot, Sir I have always ...my humble Motion.
- Crew 44 After long Debate.... following viz.
- " " We the Commons.....they differ from us.

Friday the 30th of January, 1628.

E.Parl.
p.242.

Also this day a Committee...the King answered.

Saturday the 31st of January, 1628.

Crew 45-48 Most Gracious Sovereign, We have..possible Satisfaction.

Tuesday the 3rd of February, 1628.

Crew 48-9 Secretary Cook reported.... his Fleet to Sea.
After this Apology....Petition of the Lower House.

Crew 49-51 Gentlemen, This Apology...find Cause.

O.P.H.278 Hereupon Sir John Elliot...sit in this House.

" 279 Mr. Speaker. This honourable ...Considerations.

" " Secretary Cooke, I said....accomodate it.

" " Sir Humfrey May. If ye be....daily commend.

E.Parl.243. At the Committee for Religion.

" " Sir John Elliot, For the way...seek for proof.

" " The Remonstrance....against Montague.

Crew 51-2 Mr. Kirton. The two great Bishops...and how.

" 52 Mr. Coriton. The Declaration...all good Men.

" " Sir Walter Earle. Montague...to the King.

" 52-3 Sir Humphry May. I will tell you..renounced them.

" " It was ordered...granted to the Clergy.

Wednesday the 4th of February, 1628.

E.P.243 A Bill preferred that no Clergie-man..jurisdictions.
 " 243-4 Doctor Reeves, which sat.....by the Statute.
 " 244 Mr.Selden, The point....present discharged.
 " " Doctor Talbot.....in his cause.
 " " A Petition is preferred by Thomas Ogle..Durham.
 " " Sir Enball Thelwall. There was....Puritan.
 " " Mr. Shervile, Desireth that searchexcepted.
 " " Mr.Rouse, Here are four persons....those members.
 " " Mr. Kirton moved.....at Court too.
 Crew 54-5 Sir Robert Phillips, If ever there....his Majesty.
 E.P.245 A Committee was hereupon named...these pardons.
 " " Sir Edward Giles, I know not....Mr.Attorney.
 " " Which was ordered.
 " " Sir James Perott complaineth...sense to these.
 " " Mr. Pym doth make....of King James.
 Crew 55-6 Sir Robert Phillips made Report...and Manwaring/
 " 55 It was order'd that a Sub-Com....sent to the Parties.
 E.P.245 That Mr. Attorney may be asked....prest thereunto.

Thursday the 5th of February, 1628.

E.P.246 A Petition in Complaint.....Committee for Grievances.
 " " Some differences being observed...differences come in.
 " " Mr. Long Complaineth..Committee for Religion.
 " " The Preachers are to be chosen..for Religion.
 " " Secretary Cooke, Saith, He hath..the whole kingdom.
 " " Mr. Ogle, Is called...same by witnesses.
 " " It is Ordered, that Cosens.....in like cases.
 " " If Witnesses be sent for....their own charges.
 " " Sir Robert Phillips, Moveth....it is granted.

Friday the 6th of February, 1628.

Crew 57 The House being informed...disgrac'd him.
 " " Whereupon.....should be sent for.
 E.P.246 Mr. Harris.....Preachers themselves.
 " 247 Mr.Sherwill, Reported...the King thereby.
 " " Sir Nathaniel Ritch, That we...as well as we.
 " " The Council of Mr. Jones....Monday next.
 Crew 58-9 Sir Robert Philips returned... as a Bagge-Fellow.
 " 59-60 Sir John Elliot { It is our Honour....so obnoxious.
 E.P.257-8 { Here is high Treason...some Minister.
 Crew 60 Whereupon it was....should be sent for.
 E. P. 248 Mr. Attorney being by Writ....on Monday next.

Saturday the 7th of February, 1628.

E. P. 248	A Bill against Spiritual Symonie...judicature.
" "	Mr. Kirton moved, That a time...Poundage.
" "	Sir Walter Earle secondeth...which is theirs.
" "	Sir Walter moveth.....moved therein.
" "	It is Ordered.....incident thereto.
" "	Mr. Sherwill is nominated.....Committee.
" "	Sir Rober Philips, Reported.....Come off to him.
" "	This is referred.....to be examined.
" 249	Mr. Selden Reported.....Allen...it was another.
" "	Sir Robert Phillips, That he....shall think fit.
" "	Mr. Pym, That other.....punishment.
" "	Ordered that Allen.....on Monday next.
" "	Mr. Shervile, That the Committee..this afternoon.
" "	Mr. Selden reported.....for time to come.
" "	Sir John Stanhope, Moveth....the hand or no.
" "	Mr. Lynne declareth.....he knew not the hand.
" "	Sir Nathaniel Ritch thanked...the whole House.
Crew 62	Sir John Elliot reply'd, In this Land...accordingly.
E.P. 250	Sir Daniel Norton That a Doctor...stood as Altars.
Crew 61	Sir Robert Philips (said by this.....and rebelPopery.
E.P.250	(Thus you see....to the Pardons.

E. P. 250 Chancellor of the Dutchie, This trencheth..proved.
 " " Sir Thomas Heale Saith to be head....with his life.
 " " Mr. Valentine Saith, That this Bishop...Table There.
 " " The Speakers Letter is to go for Doctor Moore.

Crew 62-5 Monday the 9th of February, 1628.

Tuesday the 10th of February, 1628.
 was

Crew 65-6 A Bill/^{was}prefer'd.....and Magistrates.
 " 66 Mr. Rolls complaineth....suff'rd to be read.
 " " Sir Robert Philips said....vain to sit here.
 " 67 Sir Humphry May... This proceeds...as above said.
 " " Mr. Selden said, This is not... the Cause of this.
 E. P. 252 It is ordered that Shemington....to the House.
 " " A Committee of Six are appointed....inform them.
 " " A general Order.....shall think fit.
 " " The privilege of the Merchants...Star Chamber.
 " " Sheriff Acton called into the Barre...of the House.
 " " Mr. Long moved ~~that~~ he might be sent to the Tower.
 " " Sir Francis Seymour, That he may now...punishment.
 " 253 Mr. Selden, I cannot remember....to the Tower.
 " " Mr. Kirton, I came.....to the Tower.

E. P. 253 Mr. Littleton, You see...vain to sit here.
 " " The Sheriff is again called....to the Tower.
 " " Sir Ben Ruddiard, There be diverse...is Ordered.
 " " It is ordered, that Worsmann...upon Fryday.

Wednesday the 11th of February, 1628.

Crew 69 Mr. Selden reported concerning....the Merchants.
 " " The Copy of the Bill.....of the Kingdom.
 " " This being a Business.....Morning.
 " " Also that Report be made then....likewise order'd.
 " " That in respect the Term ends....Leave of the House.
 " 70 Order'd also that.....for Sir Edward Cooke.
 " " Mr. Waller, at the Committee for Religion..Chaplains.
 " " One of the Printers said.....same licans'd.
 " 70-1 Mr. Selden reply'd, That...Liberty of the Subject.
 " 71 Thereupon he mov'd a Law be made in this.
 " " This is refer'dto be examined.
 " 71-2 Mr. Sherland reported concerning the Pardons..Warrant.
 O.P.H.8, Mr. Oliver Cromwell said, That he heard...not expect./?/
 289.
 Crew 72 Sir Robert Philips said, One Dr. Marshall...Alabaster.
 " 72-3 Mr. Kirton. That Dr. Marshall...hand in hand.

Crew 73 Sir Miles Fleetwood saith, We are...Aggravation.
 " " Sir Walter Earle said Qui color...Montague.
 " 74 Order'd a Select Committee....Remedy.

Thursday the 12th of February.

Crew 74 The Sheriff of London.....in the Tower.
 " " Sir John Elliot made Report... by their Goods.
 " 75 At a Great Committee..Mr. Sherland in the Chair.
 " " Mr. Waller deliver'd a Petition...to be undone.
 " " Mr. Wansford conceiveth...us to go in.
 " " Mr. Coriton. Let it be done....unto him.
 " 75-6 Mr. Strowdle. That it may be...on the Bill.
 " 76 Chancellor of the Dutchy. I shall speak...here again.
 " " Mr. Treasurer. There is none here...to settle the
 " " Mr. Coriton, I hope.....divert us.
 " 77 Mr. Waller. It is not.....threatened in this.
 " " Sir Robert Philips moveth.....Interruptions.
 " " Mr. Noy said, We cannot.....give it.
 " 77-8 Mr. Selden seconds the Motion...the Law.
 " 78 Mr. Littleton. For the point...without Petition.
 " " Order'd a Message shall be sent..in this Business,

Crew 79-94

Friday the 13th of February.

Saturday the 14th of February.

Crew 94 A complaint was made.....publick Prison.
 " " Order'd that the Lord Lambert...answer this.
 " " Sir John Ipsley desireth...Higher House.
 " 94-5 Mr. Selden reply'd.....Select Committee.
 Crew 95 Order'd that Sir John Ipsley....Lords House.
 " " Mr.Chancellor of the Dutchy.....Mr. Selden.
 " " Secretary Cooke said, I am....Commonwealth.
 " " Order'd that a special....confer of this.
 " 96 Mr. Chancdlor of the Dutchy delivereth..Commons.
 " 96-8 Whereas the Honourable...Sign'd...Vernon.
 " 98 Mr. Kirton. We look'd fof.....Exchequer.
 " " Order'd that a Select.....consideration.
 " 98-9 Mr. Selden said, We have.....Monday next.
 " 99 Which is ordered.

E.P.2 60.

At the Committee for Religion.

Crew 99 Sir Thomas Hobby reported....were discharged.
 " 100 Sir Nathaniel Rich reply'd....Directions or no.
 " " It is mov'd that Secretary Cooke...Knowledge in this.

Crew 100-1 Secretary Cooke thereupon...Declaration..Mr. Long.
 E. P. 260 One Dross, gave.....Supream power.
 Crew 102 Sir Thomas Seymour with vehemency....Mr. Long.
 " 103 Mr. Cross the Pursivant.....Council-board.
 " 101-2 Sir John Elliot said, In all this... of these men.
 " 103 It is order'd that Mr.Recorder shall be...here.
 " " Secretary Cooke said, That herein.....Priests.
 " " Sir John Elliot answer'd.....such Advice.
 " 103-4 Sir Nathaniel Rich, These Jesuits...Maintainers.
 " 104 Mr. Long being call'd....and so arose.
 " " Mr. Selden declar'd, That.....done in it.
 " " The further Examination....Committee.

Monday the 16th of February, 1628.

E. P. 261 A Petition of Complaint against Sir Henry Martin..use.
 " " Sir Henry Martin, If I prove not.....be a Jew.
 " " Referred to the Committee for course of justice.

At the Committee for Religion.

Crew 104-5 Sir Henry Martin made Report....from his Majesty.
 E.P.261 Master Stroud, That the Lord Chief Justice..contrarie.
 " " Chancellor of the Dutchie, That was..his proceedings.

Crew 105-6 Sir Thomas Seymour made Report...as followeth.
 Rush.I, 657 I did receive (said the Attorney)..of their Goods.
 Crew 106 It is order'd that such as are not convicted...
 Crew 107-8 Mr. Selden reported, That he....were refus'd.
 Crew 108 Sir Robert Philips. Never was the like..be Parties.
 E.P. 261 Ordered, That two Members.....Justice Crook.

Tuesday the 17th of February, 1628.

Crew 108 Mr.Chambers prefer'd another Petition...James' time.
 " 109 Sir John Elliot. You see...Merchants..to their own.
 " " It is order'd that the Customers...Committee.
 " " Also it is order'd a Committee of six..Morning..
 " " It is also order'd ~~that~~ a Committee...in vain.
 " 109-12 /For the rest of this day follow Crew exactly/

Wednesday the 18th of February, 1628.

Crew 112 A Publick Fast.....three Sermons.

Thursday the 19th of February, 1628.

Crew 112-3 Mr. Daws, one of the Customers...further Answer.
 Crew 113 Mr. Carmarthen, another Customer...could not.
 " 113-4 Mr.Wansford mov'd that.....determined.
 " 114 Mr. Selden. If there be any....to sit here.

- Crew 114 Sir Nathaniel Rich moveth not...Parliament-man.
 " " Sir John Elliot. The Heart-Blood...of this House.
 " " It is resolv'd by Question.....Consequence.
 " " It is order'd that the House....Debate.
 " 115 Mr. Herbert in the Chair of this Committee.

Friday the 20th of February, 1628.

- Crew 115 A Petition of Complaint....Courts of Justice.
 " 115-9 /Follow Crew exactly for rest of day/

Crew 119-28 Saturday the 21st of February, 1628.

- Crew 129-32 Monday the 23rd of February, 1628.
 " 132 Hereupon the House was adjourned until Wednesday.
 " " And upon Wednesday the Heads...as followeth.
 " 132-45 Heads or Articles....Soundness of Doctrine.
 " 132 The King ..adjourned...Monday following.

Crew 145 Monday the 2d of March, 1628, being the
 last day of Sitting.

- Arch. 38,¹
 242. "As soon as praiers were ended, the Speaker
 went into the Chaire, and delivered the Kinges
 command for the adjournment of the Howse until
 Tuesday sevenight following, being the
 tenth of March."

1. Archaeologia, Vol. 38, pp.242-4, Verulam Mss. for Mac. 2.
 Ed. John Bruce.

- Crew 147 The House said.....satisfy the King.
- " 155 The Speaker said... Mr.Valentine and others.
- " " Mr. Hollis, notwithstanding...them to rise.
- " 147 "Sir John Elliot thereupon offered a Remonstrance"
- Arch. 38,
242 but the Speaker refused to doe it and said he
was otherwise commanded from the King."
- " " "And being yet againe pressed, hee still denied
note 1 to put it to the question, or to read it: which
the Clerk also refused to doe."
- Arch. 38,
244. "The King, hearing the Howse continued to sitt
(notwithstanding his command for the adjournement
thereof), sent a messenger for the Serjant with
his mace, which being taken from the table
there cann be noe further proceedings; but the
key of the dore was taken from the Serjant and
delivered to Sir Miles Hubert to keepe, who
after he had receaved the same, put the Serjant
out of the Howse, leaving his mace behind him,
and then locked the dore."
- Ib. " "Mr. Strowd spake much to the same effect, and
tould the Speaker that he was the instrument
to cutt of the libertie of the subject by the roote

and that if he would not be persuaded to put the same to question, they must all retorne as scattered sheepe, and a scorne put upon them as it was last session."

- Crew 155. Then the Speaker.....of his Sovereign.
- Crew 145-6 Sir John Elliot stood up...will begin again.
- " 147 In the great Business....serve his own turn.
- Arch. 38: "And being the third time urged to it and
243 note. refusing, still insisting upon the King's command, he was checked by Mr. Selden."
- Crew 154-5 Mr. Speaker, If you will not...be a Speaker.
- " 156 Mr. Selden reply'd, That.....Orations.
- " 156-7 Sir Peter Hayman...Kinsman¹...could prevail.
- " 157 Theyrequir'd Mr. Hollis...as followeth, viz.
- " 157-8 First, Whoever shall bring....to the same.
- " 158 These being read.....down two Hours.
- " 159 The King sent Maxwell....might have ensur'd.
- " 159-61 The King's Speech.....Faithful Nobility.

1. Kentish man. (Verulam) 4.